

1 KEVIN V. RYAN (CABN 118321)
United States Attorney

2 MARK L. KROTKOFSKI (CABN 138549)
3 Chief, Criminal Division

4 DEREK R. OWENS (CABN 230237)
5 Special Assistant United States Attorney

6 450 Golden Gate Avenue, 11th Floor
7 San Francisco, California 94102
Telephone: (415) 436-6488
Fax: (415) 436-7234
Email: Derek.Owens@usdoj.gov

8 Attorneys for Plaintiff

9
10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
11 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
12 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

13
14 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) CR No.: 06-0557 VRW
15)
16 Plaintiff,) STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]
17 v.) ORDER EXCLUDING TIME
18 JOSE VASQUEZ GARCIA,)
19 Defendant.)
20

21 On October 3, 2006, the parties in this case appeared before the Court for a status
22 conference. At that time, the parties stipulated that time should be excluded from the
23 Speedy Trial Act calculations from October 3, 2006, through October 24, 2006, for
24 continuity of counsel and for effective preparation of defense counsel. The parties
25 represented that granting the continuance was the reasonable time necessary for effective
26 preparation of defense counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18
27 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(B)(iv). The parties also agreed that the ends of justice served by
28 granting such a continuance outweighed the best interests of the public and the defendant

1 in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A).

2
3 SO STIPULATED:

4 KEVIN V. RYAN
United States Attorney
5

6 DATED: 10/10/2006

/s/ Derek R. Owens

7 DEREK R. OWENS
Special Assistant United States Attorney
8

9 DATED: 10/11/06

/s/ Elizabeth Falk

10 ELIZABETH FALK
Attorney for Jose Vasquez Garcia
11

12 As the Court found on October 3, 2006, and for the reasons stated above, the Court
13 finds that an exclusion of time between October 3, 2006, through October 24, 2006, is
14 warranted and that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best
15 interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. §3161 (h)(8)(A).
16 The failure to grant the requested continuance would deny defense counsel the reasonable
17 time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence,
18 and would result in a miscarriage of justice. See 18 U.S.C. §3161(h)(8)(B)(iv).
19

20 SO ORDERED.

21 DATED: 10/24/2006



22 THE HONORABLE VAUGHN R. WALKER
United States District Court Judge
23
24
25
26
27
28